

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 9, and 11 remain in the application and claims 1 and 9 have been amended hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1 and 3-5 under 35 USC 102(e), as being anticipated by Watanabe.

A features of the asynchronous wireless transmission method and apparatus according to the present invention is to form a wireless transmission packet by combining a monopayload wireless packet with a multipayload wireless packet. The monopayload wireless packet is formed by adding a preamble to a previously formed monopayload packet, and the multipayload wireless packet is formed by adding a preamble to a previously formed multipayload packet. The resulting wireless transmission packet is illustrated in Fig. 4, and described in page 17, line 12 to page 18, line 15 of the present application, for example.

Independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended to recite these features of the present invention.

Looking at Watanabe we see in Fig. 2 that it teaches a wireless transmission packet, similar to the prior art wireless transmission packet shown in Fig. 18 of the present application. That is, the wireless transmission packet of Watanabe is formed by a preamble section followed by header information followed by

multiple payloads and not of independent wireless packets, as shown in Fig. 4 of the present application and as recited in the amended claims.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that Watanabe is silent about forming a multipayload packet. Watanabe's information packets 125 to 128 in Fig. 2 are single packets associated with headers 121 to 124 and the error correction packet 106 is associated with header 104.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 1, and the claims depending therefrom, are not anticipated by Watanabe.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 6 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of Raychaudhuri et al.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1, which rejection over Watanabe has been addressed above and, because there are no features in Raychaudhuri et al. that somehow could be combined with Watanabe and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 is patentable distinct over Watanabe in view of Raychaudhuri et al.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 9 and 11 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of Sugita '158.

Amended apparatus claim 9 corresponds to amended method claim 1, which rejection over Watanabe has been addressed above and, for at least the same above-noted reasons, claim 9 is submitted to be patentably distinct over Watanabe. Further, because there are no features in Sugita '158 that somehow could be combined with Watanabe and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 9, and claim 11 depending therefrom, are patentable distinct over Watanabe in view of Sugita '158.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and is not seen to show or suggest the present invention as recited in the amended claims.

Favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
COOPER & DUNHAM LLP



Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27, 213

JHM/PCF:pmc